

[27th March 1923]

- 4.—(1) One municipality and one union were created. Two municipalities and 46 unions were abolished.
- (2) Proposals for the formation of new municipalities were received from four\* districts and those for union boards from five† districts. Sanction was accorded for the constitution of one union board, but it was subsequently abolished. The other proposals were not approved mainly for the reason that public opinion was strongly against them. In some cases one or other of the following reasons prevailed :—
- (1) Impossibility of securing suitable councillors and chairman.
  - (2) Illiteracy and the agricultural nature of the population.
  - (3) The smallness of the extent and the population.

## II

### COMMUNICATION TO THE COUNCIL.

The SECRETARY laid on the table a copy of the order of the hon. the President delegating his powers under the Standing Orders to the Deputy President.

*Order by the Hon'ble the President dated the 26th March 1923.*

Under Standing Order No. 79-A, I hereby delegate all my powers under the Standing Orders to the Deputy President, Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai Avargal, to be exercised by him during my absence from Madras.

P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR,  
*President, Madras Legislative Council.*

## III

### THE FINANCE AND RETRENCHMENT COMMITTEES.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Mr. President, in lieu of making the usual motion under Resolution No. 17 passed at the meeting of the 1st April 1921, I beg to make the motion standing in my name on the notice paper, namely—

*That the Council do request the existing members of the Finance and the Retrenchment Committees to continue in the exercise of their functions.*

These, as the Council are aware, are not statutory committees, although a majority of their members are elected by the House. The reason for which I make the suggestion that they should continue is that the members of the Finance Committee, having been constituted at the instance of the House into members of the Retrenchment Committee, are now in the midst of a very far-reaching enquiry, and it is important that they should continue without a change of personnel, which might involve the recommencement of a part or the whole of it. This is so in the case of the Retrenchment Committee only. As regards the Finance Committee, there is no reason why we should not elect the committee as usual, and I am quite ready to make a motion to that effect if such is the wish of the House; but it seems hardly worth while to do so since the amount of work that is likely to fall to be done

\* South Kanara, Ramnagar, Salem and Vizagapatam.

† Coimbatore (Audiyyur), Guntur, Tanjore, Chingleput and Madura.